

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY "EXPRESS MAIL" (37 CFR 1.10)**Applicant(s): **Donald A. Blackwell**

Docket No.

**15436.228.1.1**

Application No.

**10/763,310**

Filing Date

**January 23, 2004**

Examiner

**Khiem M. Nguyen**

Customer No.

**022913**

Group Art Unit

**2839**Invention: **NOT PLUGGABLE ADAPTER FOR LEGACY POWER SUPPLY CONNECTORS**

I hereby certify that the following correspondence:

Issue Fee Transmittal Letter (1 pg. in duplicate); PTOL-85B Transmittal (1 pg., in duplicate); Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (1 pg.); PTO-2038 Credit Card Form in the amount of \$1,703.00 (1 pg.); Certificate of Express Mail Label No. EV 657 810 302 US and postcard

*(Identify type of correspondence)*

is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

May 9, 2005*(Date)***ERIC L. MASCHOFF***(Typed or Printed Name of Person Mailing Correspondence)**(Signature of Person Mailing Correspondence)***EV 657 810 302 US***("Express Mail" Mailing Label Number)***Note: Each paper must have its own certificate of mailing.**



PATENT APPLICATION  
Docket No: 15436.228.1.1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Donald A. Blackwell

Serial No: 10/763,310

Filed: January 23, 2004

For: HOT PLUGGABLE ADAPTER FOR LEGACY POWER  
SUPPLY CONNECTORS

Examiner: Khiem M. Nguyen

)  
)  
)  
) Art Unit  
) 2839  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in the communications mailed on February 9, 2005. The Applicant concurs with the Examiner's conclusion that the prior art does not suggest or render obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims in the above-identified application allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that distinguish the claim from the prior art and make it allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2005

By:

ERIC L. MASCHOFF  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 36,596  
Customer No. 022913